



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,941	05/02/2001	Wayne K. Dunshee	56703USA8A.002	6157
26813	7590	12/16/2003	EXAMINER	
MUETING, RAASCH & GEBHARDT, P.A. P.O. BOX 581415 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55458			LEWIS, KIM M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3761	

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/847,941

Applicant(s)

DUNSHEE, WAYNE K.

Examiner

Kim M. Lewis

Art Unit

3761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 23 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 19-22, 24-51, 53, 54, 56, 57 and 59-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13-18, 52, 55 and 58 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 9413.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: *Detailed Action*.

Art Unit: 3761

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 6/12/03 and 9/26/03 has been received and made of record. Note the acknowledged forms PTO-1449 enclosed herewith.

Drawings

The replacement drawings, which were to be filed with the amendment of 9/17/03 were not received. Please submit the replacement pages in response to the present office action.

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed on 9/17/03 has been received and made of record. As requested, the amendment to the specification has been amended.

The examiner acknowledges applicant's request to indicate the claims rejection under double patenting rejections as allowable, however, since the claims are provisionally rejected, they are nevertheless rejected and not allowable. Therefore, the request to indicate the rejected claims as being allowable is denied.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the

Art Unit: 3761

unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 12, 24-27, 37-40, 50-51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59-61 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 17, 30 and 51 of copending Application No. 09/934450 ("the '450 application") in view of Visintainer.

As regards claim 1, claim 17 of the '450 application discloses substantially all features of the claim except a plurality of terminal portions extending outwardly from a central portion, wherein each terminal portion of the plurality of terminal portions tapers towards a tip located distal from the central portion, wherein each terminal portion of the plurality of terminal portions comprises two edges leading to the tip, the two edges defining an included angle of about 90 degrees or less.

Visintainer discloses a decorative bandage set comprising the ornamental design of various shaped bandages. Included in the set are triangular and square (diamond) shaped bandages. The square (diamond) bandages comprise a plurality of terminal portions extending outwardly from a central portion, wherein each terminal portion of the plurality of terminal portions tapers towards a tip located distal from the central portion,

Art Unit: 3761

wherein each terminal portion of the plurality of terminal portions comprises two edges leading to the tip, the two edges defining an included angle of about 90 degrees.

It would have been to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the bandages of the '450 application in any shape in the set disclosed by Visintainer for ornamental purposes.

As regards claims 2, 3 and 5-7, note the Figs. of Visintainer.

As regards claim 12, claim 30 of the '450 application discloses the central portion as having a tab.

As regards claims 24, 25, 37 and 38 both the '450 application and Visintainer fail to teach the claimed setback width and setback distance. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to add these particulars to the modified device of the '450 application since the applicant has not disclosed that these particular dimensions solve any stated problem or are for any particular purpose, and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with different setback widths and setback distances.

Whether these particulars solve any particular problem or produce any unexpected result, I must conclude that they are merely matters of engineering design choice, and thus do not serve to patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art of record. *In re Kuhle*, 526 F.2d 53, 188 USPQ (CCPA 1975).

As regards claims 26, 27, 39 and 40, note the Figs. of Visintainer.

As regard claims 50, 51 and 59, claim 51 of the '450 application substantially disclose all features of method claim except a plurality of terminal portions extending

Art Unit: 3761

outwardly from a central portion, wherein each terminal portion of the plurality of terminal portions tapers towards a tip located distal from the central portion, wherein each terminal portion of the plurality of terminal portions comprises two edges leading to the tip, the two edges defining an included angle of about 90 degrees or less. Note the double patenting rejection of claim 1 above, which discusses obviousness of the absent feature.

As regards claim 53, 56, 60 and 61, note the rejection of claims 24, 25, 37 and 38 above.

As regards claims 54 and 57, note the double patenting rejection of claims 50 and 51 of the '450 application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claims 4, 8-11, 28-32, 41-45 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 17 of the '450 application in view of Visitainer and Curad

As regards claims 4, 28 and 41, both the '450 application and Visintainer fail to teach radiused tips. However, Curad teaches additional ornamental designs of bandages, such bandages have radiused tips.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the modified device of the '450 application with radiused tips for ornamental purposes.

As regards claim 8, both the '450 application and Visitainer fail to teach that the plurality of terminal portions comprises only one pair of opposing terminal portions,

Art Unit: 3761

wherein each pair of opposing terminal portions comprises two terminal portions located on opposite sides of the central portion and aligned along a common axis extending through the tips of the pair of opposing terminal portions.

Curad teaches additional ornamental designs of bandages, wherein, one of the bandages comprises only one pair of opposing terminal portions, wherein each pair of opposing terminal portions comprises two terminal portions located on opposite sides of the central portion and aligned along a common axis extending through the tips of the pair of opposing terminal portions.

As regards claim 9-11, both the '450 application and Visintainer fail to teach the disclosed bandage configurations. However, Curad also teaches bandages having a plurality of terminal portions, wherein the plurality of terminal portions comprises two or more pairs of opposing terminal portions, wherein each pair of opposing terminal portions comprises two terminal portions located on opposite sides of the central portions and aligned along a common axes extending through the tips of the pair of opposing terminal portions, and further wherein the common axes of two or more pairs of opposing terminal portions are aligned with each other.

Curad further teaches bandages having a plurality of terminal portions, wherein the plurality of terminal portions comprises only two pairs of opposing terminal portions, wherein each pair of opposing terminal portions comprises two terminal portions located on opposite sides of the central portion and aligned along a common axis extending through the tips of the pair of opposing terminal portions and further wherein the common axes of the two pairs of opposing terminal portions intersect each other within

Art Unit: 3761

the central portion of the backing, and wherein the common axes are substantially perpendicular.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the modified bandage of the '450 application in the shapes disclosed in Curad for ornamental purposes.

As regards the rejection of claims 29 and 42, note the rejection of claim 8.

As regards the rejection of claims 30 and 43, note the rejection of claim 9.

As regards the rejection of claims 31, 32, 44 and 45, note the rejection of claims 10 and 11.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claims 19-22, 33-36 and 46-49 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11, 12, 19 and 28 of copending Application No. 09/847942 ("the '942 application") in view of Visintainer.

As regards claims 19-22, 33-36 and 46-49, claims 11, 12 19 and 28 of the '942 application disclose the claimed adhesive components and backing material (substrate), but fails to teach the shape of the medical article as claimed in claim 19-22, 33-36 and 46-49.

Visintainer discloses a decorative bandage set comprising the ornamental design of various shaped bandages. Included in the set are triangular and square (diamond) shaped bandages. The square (diamond) bandages comprise a plurality of terminal

Art Unit: 3761

portions extending outwardly from a central portion, wherein each terminal portion of the plurality of terminal portions tapers towards a tip located distal from the central portion, wherein each terminal portion of the plurality of terminal portions comprises two edges leading to the tip, the two edges defining an included angle of about 90 degrees.

It would have been to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the bandages of the '942 application in any shape in the set disclosed by Visintainer for ornamental purposes.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 13-18, 52, 55, 58 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 23 is allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record fails to teach or fairly suggest a medical article comprising a predefined tab located within the central portion of the backing, wherein the predefined tab comprises a fold" as per instant claims 13-18 and 23.

The prior art also fails to teach or fairly suggest a method of removing a medical article from the skin comprising the step of "grasping the medical article within the central portion; and stretching the medical article within the central portion to remove the medical article from the skin". Although the prior art teaches that stretch removable

Art Unit: 3761

adhesive articles are known, these tapes are generally stretched lengthwise in a direction parallel to the surface to which they are applied (*i.e.*, they are either stretched from one end as disclosed by U.S. Patent No. 4,024,312 or stretched from both ends as disclosed by EP Patent Application No. 0 747 027 A2).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim M. Lewis whose telephone number is 703.308.1191. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays and Tuesdays from 6:30 am to 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 703.308.1957. The fax phone numbers for

Art Unit: 3761

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703.305.3590 for regular communications and 703.305.3590 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703.308.0858.



Kim M. Lewis
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3761

kml
December 10, 2002